

**REMARKS**

This application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action dated January 21, 2004. A one-month petition for extension of time is filed concurrently herewith. Claims 1-2 and 28-29 have been amended. Claims 3, 6, 25, 30-31, 33, and 52 have been canceled. Claims 1-2, 4, and 28-29 are now pending. Applicants reserve the right to pursue the original claims and other claims in this and other applications.

Claim 1 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. The rejection is traversed. Claim 1 has been clarified as required. Note that in the preferred embodiment, Fig. 6, the abscissa is the product of the height of the recesses and projections times the birefringence ( $\Delta n$ ) of the liquid crystal material (Pg. 21, lines 11-15).

Claims 1-2, 4, and 28 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Okamoto. The rejection is traversed.

The present invention is directed to applying a light diffusive electrode to a liquid crystal display device having a normally closed display mode. Previously, it was believed not to be possible to apply the light diffusive electrode to a liquid crystal display device having a normally closed display mode. In the light diffusive reflective electrode, there is an unevenness which effects the retardation in a liquid crystal layer that results in fluctuations. In such a prior art device, the contrast ratio decreased.

Applicants discovered that the fluctuations of the retardation of the liquid crystal layer are dependent on the twist angle. In other words, as the twist angle becomes larger, the fluctuations of the retardation is smaller. Okamoto does not teach or suggest that the "a product of a height of said recesses and projections times a birefringence of said liquid crystal layer is in the range of about 10 to 53 nm at said twist angle of about 40 degrees and about 10 to 64 nm at said twist angle of about 65 degrees, respectively," as recited in claims 1 and 28.

Claims 2 and 4 depend from claim 1 and are allowable along with claim 1 for at least the reasons provided above. Claim 28, as amended, should be allowable for reasons similar to those discussed above. Claim 29 depends from claim 28 and is allowable along with claim 28 for at least the reasons provided above. Withdrawal of the § 102(e) rejection is solicited.

In view of the above, each of the presently pending claims in this application is believed to be in immediate condition for allowance. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to pass this application to issue.

Dated: May 13, 2004

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Mark J. Thronson

Registration No.: 33,082

DICKSTEIN SHAPIRO MORIN &

OSHINSKY LLP

2101 L Street NW

Washington, DC 20037-1526

(202) 785-9700

Attorney for Applicants